DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 118 PS 017 597

AUTHOR Ostrowski, Patricia Maslin
TITLE The Status of Transition Class Programs in Rhode Island Elementary Schools.
INSTITUTION Rhode Island State Dept. of Elementary and Secondary Education, Providence.
PUB DATE 17 Mar 88
NOTE 31p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Education; *Program Implementation; *Public Schools; *School Districts; School Surveys; State Programs; *Transitional Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Program Characteristics; *Rhode Island

ABSTRACT

To learn the extent to which transition class programs had been implemented in the Rhode Island public schools, all districts in the state were surveyed. The survey was designed to gather basic information about transition programs operating throughout the state, and learn why such programs have not been introduced in some districts. Findings, which are based on data collected from the 38 Rhode Island districts that operate elementary schools, concern the number of districts with transition programs, starting date, program purposes, selection criteria, class size and percentage of originating class, length of school day, programs that serve the same purpose as transition classes, procedures used to modify transition placements, and the relationship of per pupil expenditure to transition programs. Findings regarding districts without transition programs are briefly discussed. In general, transition programs are rapidly gaining acceptance in the Rhode Island public school system, especially at the pre-first-grade level. This implies that the transition between kindergarten and first grade presents significant problems to a multitude of elementary students. Schools are divided about the primary purpose of their transition programs. Implications are discussed and related materials are appended. (RH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED300118

THE STATUS OF TRANSITION CLASS PROGRAMS IN RHODE ISLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

by

Patricia Maslin Ostrowski

PS 017697

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Patricia Maslin Ostrowski
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

March 17, 1988

This publication reflects the results of a survey commissioned by the Rhode Island Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Literacy Programs Division. The interpretations and opinions of the author do no necessarily reflect the views of the Department.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank J. Troy Earhart, Rhode Island's Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education, who recognized the value of undertaking this project and agreed to support it. Thanks are also extended to Marie DiBiaso, Director of Literacy and Dropout Prevention Programs, who saw the connection between transition programs and her division, and was willing to sponsor this research. Special thanks go to John Pitman, Educational Specialist, who has provided me with ongoing critical assistance and encouragement in my work for the Department of Education. I additionally want to show my appreciation to Susan Moore Johnson from Harvard University for her insightful help with editing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction

Purpose of study
Definition of a transition class

II. Survey Findings

A. Findings Regarding Districts That Have Transition Programs
Number of districts with transition programs
Initiation of transition programs
Purpose of transition programs
Criteria for selection
Class size and percent of originating class
Length of school day
Programs that serve same purpose as transition class
Procedures to modify transition placements
Relationship of per pupil expenditure to transition programs

B. Findings Regarding Districts That Do Not Have Transition Programs

III. Interpretation and Conclusions

IV. Implications of Study

Appendices

A. Sample Survey
B. Districts With Transition Programs: Level and Number of Classes
C. Initiation of Transition Programs
D. Primary Purpose of Transition Programs in RI Districts
E. Class Size and Percent of Originating Class
F. Class Size in Rank Order
G. Percent of Originating Class in Rank Order
H. Relationship of Per Pupil Expenditure (PPE) and Percent of Originating Class and Primary Purpose of Transition Programs
I. Districts Without Transition Programs

List of Tables

Table I. Level and Number of Programs
Table II. Timeline
Table III. Selection Criteria
Table IV. Percent of Class of Origin and Number of Districts
Table V. Reasons Not to Have Transition Programs

I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of study

Across the country parents, teachers and school officials are talking about transition classes in elementary schools. Transition classes, which are further defined below, are extra grades that schools provide for children considered not ready to graduate to the next grade level along with their peer groups. People are curious about what this innovative practice is and just what it can offer young students. Indeed, these discussions are beginning to turn into a debate over the pros and cons of transition grades. In an effort to learn the prevalence of transition class programs in Rhode Island public schools, the Rhode Island Department of Education has conducted a survey of all districts. The study was designed to gather basic information about transition programs currently operating throughout the state, as well as to ask districts that do not have such programs why they have chosen not to initiate them.

Definition of a transition class

Transition classes are defined as special intermediary grades that schools have created for children who are not ready to be promoted to the next grade. Students selected for transition classes are typically lagging behind their classmates according to academic and/or social criteria. Districts tend to institute transition programs preceding kindergarten and first grade, and occasionally to lead the way to upper level elementary grades, e.g. pre-two and pre-three. Common names for a transition program between kindergarten and first grade include

pre-one, transitional one, developmental one and a readiness class. At the end of the transition class experience students return to a regular class where with few exceptions, they remain a year behind in chronological age.

The report that follows has been divided into four sections:

I. Introduction,
II. Survey Findings,
III. Interpretation and Conclusions, and
IV. Implications of Study.

II. SURVEY FINDINGS

All findings reported here are based on data collected from the 38 Rhode Island districts that have elementary schools. A survey was sent to each district with a 100% return rate. (See Appendix A for sample survey.)

A. Findings Regarding Districts That Have Transition Programs

Number of districts with transition programs

Over 60% of the Rhode Island elementary districts (23 out of 38) offer some form of a transition program. All are in the early primary grades and, as the following breakdown shows, the large majority directly precedes first grade:

Table I

Level and Number of Programs

Level	Number of Programs
Pre-kindergarten	4
Pre-one	24*
Pre-two	1

*There are 24 programs in 23 districts because one district offers two distinct programs at pre-one level.

Thus there are a total of 29 transition programs found in 23 different school districts. (See Appendix B for details.) These programs reflect a total of 82 individual classes. Clearly, the pre-one level is seen as the most appropriate place to furnish an additional grade.

Initiation of transition programs

All transition programs in the state were initiated within the past ten years. (See Appendix C for details.) The phenomenon began when two districts pioneered transition classes in 1978 and has continued to grow with one district starting a program as recently as January, 1988. Each of these programs is still in operation today. The timeline is depicted below.

Table II

Timeline

Year Began	Number of Districts*
1978	2
1979	0
1980	1
1981	1
1982	0
1983	2
1984	5
1985	6
1986	2
1987	4
1988	1

*It appears that 24 districts are represented here rather than 23 because one district inaugurated two distinct programs during two different years.

Purpose of transition programs

Districts were asked to identify the primary purpose of their transition programs. About 1/3 (8 districts) reported that their primary goal was to improve students' social/emotional

development while approximately 1/4 or 6 districts stated that the primary purpose was to improve students' academic performance. One site added physical development to the goal of social/emotional development. The remaining 10 districts reported that their programs had a dual objective of improving both academic and social/emotional development. One of these also included the goal of helping students to develop a positive attitude toward learning. (See Appendix D for details.)

Here again the total number of districts appears to be 24 rather than 23 due to one district that offers a transitional-one class with an essentially academic purpose while concurrently providing a pre-one class that has the primary purpose of enhancing social/emotional development. This transitional-one program appears to be an anomaly in Rhode Island since it functions as a true first grade, i.e. students at the end of the year typically graduate to second rather than first grade.

Criteria for selection

Each district indicated the criteria used to assign students to transition classes. These data are summarized in Table III. (See page 5.) Two criteria universally used by Rhode Island districts are:

1. social/emotional maturity and
2. teacher recommendation.

Interestingly, academic performance is ranked below these two items, followed by parental approval and test scores. Criteria least used according to this list are the student's birthday and physical size.

Table III

Selection Criteria*

	Criterion	Yes	No
1.	Academic performance	20	4
2.	Social/emotional maturity	24	0
3.	Teacher recommendation	24	0
4.	Student's birthday	10	14
5.	Parental approval	19	5
6.	Size of student	2	22
7.	Test scores**	18	6

*Total is 24 because one district applies different criteria to two different programs.

**Four districts indicated that they use Gesell assessment instruments. (It is possible that more districts use these instruments yet did not specifically list them.)

Districts were invited to expand the above set of criteria to describe their particular programs. Additional criteria that select schools use are:

1. Economic indicators,
2. Attendance records,
3. Non-mastery of readiness skills,
4. Child Find test results and
5. Information derived from contacting preschool staff.

Of these criteria only one, use of attendance records, was mentioned by multiple districts. It is interesting to note that no district reported taking into consideration the sex of the child given that there is so much discussion in the literature of how boys and girls develop at different rates. The literature on transition classes indicates that boys are more prone to being placed in these programs than girls, a practice not explored in the present study.

Although districts were asked to estimate the weight in percentages that they assign to each criterion, many did not report in this manner, and thus we cannot comment on the relative importance of the selection criteria.

Class size and percent of originating class

The state wide average class size for transition grades is 18 when considering all 29 programs. This figure, however, is only an average and reflects class sizes that range from a low of 12 to a high of 26. The median is 18. (See Appendices E, F and G for details.)

Instead of counting students, another way to get a picture of how many students are being channeled into transition programs is to ascertain the percentage that transition room students represent of their class of origin, e.g. a current pre-one class might constitute 15% of their original kindergarten class membership. Findings indicate that Rhode Island transition room students, on average, represent 17% of their class of origin. The median is 14.5%. Across districts the range is from 5.7% to 35% which is depicted in the table below.

Table IV

Percent of Class of Origin and Number of Districts

Ranges in Percent	Number of Districts
5.7-10	8
11-20	11
21-35	8

Length of school day

All 4 pre-kindergarten programs in the state operate on a half day schedule. Only 1 pre-one program meets for a half day while every other transition class functions for a full day.

Programs that serve same purpose as transition class

Districts were asked if they have any program that serves the same purpose as transition classes yet, perhaps, does not fit the survey's definition, e.g. an ungraded elementary school. No district reported having any such program.

Procedures to modify transition placements

Fourteen districts (i.e., sixty percent of the districts with programs) stated that they have procedures to monitor and modify a student's experience in the transition program, e.g. if a child is progressing faster than expected, while 8 districts have no such procedures. One district did not respond. Current modification procedures are described by the districts as follows:

Modification Procedures

1. It is possible for a child to move out of pre-kindergarten or pre-one during the year, but such movement is rare.

2. Children who are progressing faster than expected will be "mainstreamed" to a regular grade one classroom for part of the day. It will be possible for children who exhibit extraordinary progress to be transferred to a regular grade one situation during the course of the year.

3. Child is reassessed for appropriateness of placement.

4. If a child progresses faster than expected in the pre-one class it would be possible to assess the child's progress and place him/her in the first grade. The children are evaluated 4 times per year. It should be noted that this modification has never occurred.

5. Children are checked for growth in reading, math and social skills. Teams of teachers and parents make the decision.

6. a) Recommendation of classroom teacher and reading specialist to principal. b) Principal, teacher, parent conference. c) Child will: stay in Developmental I class or 1/2 time Developmental I and 1/2 time academic or transfer to academic first grade.

7. Student is mainstreamed to grade one for certain subject areas.

8. At the end of January, a child may be placed in a regular grade one class. At the end of transitional-one, a child will be assigned to a regular grade one or, in exceptional areas, to grade two.

9. Teacher/parent/administrator may present request to change the placement of a child in the transition program to the superintendent. Superintendent will convene a meeting with staff and parents to consider the request. Consensus sought but final decision rests with the superintendent.

10. Moves into regular setting after evaluation. May receive Chapter I or other intervention services.

11. At the start of the year, we do a fairly extensive evaluation of all students who are scheduled to participate in the class. If at that time a student appears inappropriately placed, then he would be returned to a regular class.

12. Modifications are only within the pre-one class.

13. Based on the makeup of the class in any given year, the primary focus of instruction may change. For example, there may be a need for basic language instruction one year. A group may be ready for formalized reading instruction earlier another year.

A district reporting no procedures to modify students' placements commented that, "Instruction is modified for every student because academically the children represent a wide spectrum of ability and achievement. They have been placed in pre-one because emotionally, socially and physically they are five to five and one half years old while chronologically being six." This statement reflects a modification that is similar to those mentioned above which are confined to changes within the transition classes.

Modifications, then, appear to fall into three categories:

1. Modifications are made within the context of the existing transition program.
2. A child's program is modified by permitting movement between transition class and regular grade level class.
3. A child may be moved out of a transition class entirely and placed in a regular grade level class.

A district may restrict itself to one category or offer modifications from multiple categories.

Relationship of per pupil expenditure to transition programs

Districts with transition programs were sorted into three groups according to their amount of per pupil expenditure (PPE) as reported in the Department of Education's 1986-87 Statistical Tables. The groups included districts with an average, above average and below average PPE. An across district average of percent of originating class was computed for each of the three groups. The primary program purpose was cited for each district as well. (See Appendix H for details.)

It appears that PPE is not a factor in determining the

likelihood that a district will offer a transition program, i.e. a district with a below average PPE is about as likely to have transition classes as a district with an above average PPE. A comparison of the across district percent of originating class shows the following:

Districts with above average PPE = 19%
Districts with average PPE = 16%
Districts with below average PPE = 17%

While these three figures show some variation there does not appear to be a significant relationship between the economic status of a district and the percent of children who enter transition programs. There was also no significant relationship found between a district's PPE and the primary purpose of the program.

B. Findings Regarding Districts That Do Not Have Transition Programs

Out of 38 elementary school districts, 15 (40%) do not have any transition classes. (See Appendix I for details.) Thirteen of the districts have never had a transition program while 2 have had programs that were terminated. The reasons given for ending the programs were: a) pre-one program did not have district approval as constituted and b) funds ran out for project.

Four districts have never considered offering a transition program and 11 have given thought to initiating one. The reasons cited for deciding against transition grades are summarized in Table V.

Table V

Reasons Not To Have Transition Program

Reason	Number of Districts
1. Space	5
2. Budget	4
3. Small number of students did not justify extra class	1

Thus all reasons for deciding against the program were of a pragmatic nature. Three of the 11 districts are still contemplating starting a program.

Only one of the fifteen districts without transition classes reported that they have a program serving the same purpose. This district that has not considered starting a transition grade commented, "A number of elementary schools have made arrangements for first grade students to spend the morning in kindergarten and the remainder of the day in a regular first grade." Thus the district has made informal arrangements for a program that seems to function according to the transition concept yet does not have the formal title of a transition program. Perhaps, this informal program is more akin to Rhode Island's single transitional one program where students are expected to be promoted to second grade at the end of the year rather than grade one.

III. INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS

An innovation called transition programs is rapidly gaining acceptance in the Rhode Island public school system. In 1977 no transition programs could be found; a decade later 60% of the

districts have incorporated some type of transition program for elementary students. Whether a district has a program does not seem to have much to do with economics in that both wealthy and poorer districts provide transition classes. It is noteworthy that 11 out of the 15 districts not sponsoring such a program have given consideration to initiating one. The reasons cited for rejecting the program had to do with space and budgetary concerns--rather than because the administrators and staff did not believe the program itself to be educationally sound. In fact, three of these districts are still pursuing the possibility. Therefore, an overwhelming majority of districts in Rhode Island, 34 of 38 (89%), think that transition classes can offer something positive to their schools and students. Many districts (60%) have acted on this belief.

American public schools have a reputation for being slow to implement change. Thus the relatively sudden and sharp rise in transition programs speaks to the popularity of the transition concept. It also speaks to a common need that is being perceived in the lower elementary grades. Many children are not considered ready for promotion to the next grade, especially first grade. Acknowledging that something needs to be done for this growing number of students, districts have responded by providing transition classes.

The study found that the most common place to have a transition program is at the pre-one level (24 of the 29 programs or 83% fit this category). This implies that the transition between kindergarten and first grade is presenting significant

problems to a multitude of elementary students.

The numbers of children who qualify for transition programs varies from district to district. In one district, for example, a pre-one class represents about 6% of the original kindergarten class while in another district the pre-one program constitutes 35% of its originating kindergarten class. It is interesting to note that the economic levels of the districts do not distinguish percentages of students in transition classes. With the information collected we can only speculate about why there is so much variation. One possibility is that the children have a greater need for extra time and help in some districts than others. The variation, however, could be a function of the selection criteria used. Yet it might have to do with pragmatic matters such as available space and budget allocations. There is also the possibility that some teachers have a greater need for homogeneous classes. Another possible explanation is that the increasing rigor of the first grade curriculum has influenced the number of kindergarten children who are not ready for promotion.

While every district with a transition program offers classes at the pre-one level, schools are divided about the primary purpose of their programs. The most prevalent goal has a dual purpose: to improve students' academic performance while enhancing their social/emotional development. The next most popular objective is to improve students' social/emotional development followed by districts with a primary focus on academic objectives. It can be inferred from the data that there are different philosophies about what transition programs should do for children. Concomitantly, there are likely to be different

approaches to the curriculum and program modification.

The study shows that schools tend to use a common core of criteria to select students for transition programs: teacher recommendation, social/emotional maturity, academic performance, parental approval and test scores. The actual constellation of indicators may vary, however, as schools add to and subtract from this list, e.g. a site may not require parental approval yet does [illegible]eacher recommendations. Unfortunately, we do not know how important each criterion is in influencing the decision. It is likely that the philosophy underlying the program determines both the selection of criteria and the weight assigned to each.

IV. IMPLICATIONS OF STUDY

Given the unexpected and recent growth of transition programs, educators have a responsibility to learn quickly more about them and their effects. Since the transition class concept is relatively new on a large scale basis, not a great deal of research is available to help guide administrators, teachers and parents. Yet schools require reliable information in order to determine whether or not these programs are appropriate for their students. Therefore one of the major implications of this study is a demand for informative research to assist schools and communities in considering the advantages and disadvantages of this innovation.

Although the research literature on transition classes is sparse, what exists calls into question the efficacy of such programs. Researchers typically compare transition programs with

grade retention practices and conclude that children who attend transition classes (as with children who repeat a grade) are no better off over time than comparable children who have been promoted. It is clear that the practitioners view these programs more favorably or we would not be witnessing a surge in transition classes. This tension between practitioners' apparent beliefs and research findings is cause for concern. What is the best way to deal with children who are emotionally and/or academically unprepared for the next grade? Are transition classes the answer?

Each district probably has its own set of questions and concerns about the merit of transition grades. However, some of the more pressing issues that cross district boundaries are suggested below:

- What are the short and long term effects, both academic and social, that transition classes have on students?
- What are the different models of transition class programs? How do they function in different settings, e.g. urban and suburban, and with different populations of students, e.g. minorities and ESL (English as Second Language) children?
- How cost effective is an additional year (or years) of schooling spent in a transition class?
- What alternatives to transition programs exist?
- Could transition classes be a new form of tracking?
- Why are so many children today not ready for the first grade? Is it because children are different or because we have increased our standards and expectations for first grade performance? Could there be a problem with children's initial exposure to schools, i.e. the kindergarten experience?

Educators should be prepared to address these issues.

With the practice of transition programs spreading throughout the state, an opportunity arises for districts to learn from each other. It could be advantageous for district representatives to get together, e.g. at a conference or workshop, to share information and exchange ideas. Districts might also pool data in an effort to study transition programs on a state wide level.

This study has provided a broad and preliminary look at some of the variables associated with transition programs as they operate in Rhode Island. It raises a series of questions that need answers. Transition grades hold a lot of promise for elementary children and their parents. Many parents trust that by giving their children an extra year of schooling the additional time will help the children to develop better on social measures and to insure that they become competent students. Educators must look closely at transition classes and render certain that the programs can fulfill these expectations or act to alter the transition concept.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Sample Survey

Transition Class Survey

Please place a check mark on the line beside the appropriate answer or write your answer in the space provided.

Name of district_____

Title and telephone number of person completing survey:

Title_____ Telephone Number_____

1. Does your district have transition classes? If yes, what do you call them?**

YES_____ NO_____ Title(s)_____

**If your response to question #1 is yes, please skip the next two items and go to question #4. Otherwise, answer questions #2 #3, #4 and #11, and you will have completed the survey.

2. Have you ever considered offering transition classes? YES_____ NO_____

If yes, why did you decide against the program?

3. Did you have a transition class program that was terminated?

YES_____ NO_____ If yes, what year was it terminated? 19_____

If yes, why?

4. Are there any programs in your district that serve the same purpose as transition classes yet, perhaps, do not fit the survey's definition (see cover letter), e.g. ungraded elementary school?

YES_____ NO_____

If yes, please name and describe the program(s).

Name:_____
Description:

5. When did your transition class program begin? 19_____ (continued on back)

6. This is a 3-part question. Use the grid below to respond. a) Estimate the total number of classes offered annually per transition class level (e.g. pre-1, pre-2). b) Estimate the percentage that transition room students represent of their class of origin, e.g. the current pre-1 class is 15% of their original kindergarten class. c) Please check the last column if classes meet for 1/2 a day.

T-Program Level	# Classes	% Originating Class	1/2 Day
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

7. Approximately how many students are assigned per class? _____

8. Is there a procedure to modify the transition class program, e.g. if a child is progressing faster than expected?

YES_____ NO_____
If yes, please describe the procedure.

9. This is a 2-part question. First indicate what criteria are used to assign students to transition classes by checking yes or no to items below. Next go back and estimate the percentage of weight you assign to each criterion, i.e. how important is each criterion in deciding student assignments.

	YES	NO	%
-academic performance	____	____	____
-social/emotional maturity	____	____	____
-teacher recommendations	____	____	____
-student's birthday	____	____	____
-parental approval	____	____	____
-size of student	____	____	____
-test scores	____	____	____
-other_____	____	____	____
-other_____	____	____	____

10. What is the primary purpose of your transition class program? Check one:

-To improve academic performance ____
-To improve social/emotional development ____
-Other_____ ____

11. Do you want to receive a summary of the study's results? YES_____ NO_____

- Please send along any materials, e.g. brochures, flyers, syllabi, relating to your transition classes.

Thank you for your help. Please return by December 9, 1987 the survey and related materials in the enclosed envelope to: RI Department of Education, Division of Literacy Programs, 22 Hayes Street, Providence, RI 02908

APPENDIX B

Districts With Transition Programs: Level and Number of Classes

Name of District	Level and Number of Classes		
	Pre-K	Pre-One	Pre-Two
Barrington	0	2	0
Bristol	0	1	1
Burrillville	3	4	0
Central Falls	0	2	0
Charlestown	0	1	0
Cumberland	0	1	0
East Greenwich	0	1	0
Exeter-West Greenwich	0	1	0
Foster	0	1	0
Hopkinton	0	2	0
Johnston	0	1	0
Middletown	0	1	0
Narragansett	0	2	0
Newport	2	3	0
Pawtucket	0	11	0
Portsmouth	0	3	0
Providence	0	22	0
Richmond	0	1	0
South Kingston	0	2	0
Warren	1	1	0
West Warwick	0	4*	0
Westerly	0	1	0
Woonsocket	4	3	0
TOTAL CLASSES:	10	71	1

*There are 2 pre-ones that appear to function as most other pre-ones while 2 transitional-ones serve as legitimate first grades.

APPENDIX C

Initiation of Transition Programs

1978	Bristol
	Portsmouth
1980	Narragansett
1981	Charlestown
1983	South Kingston
	West Warwick*
1984	Burrillville
	Newport
	Pawtucket
	Westerly
	Woonsocket
1985	East Greenwich
	Exeter-West Greenwich
	Middletown
	Providence
	Richmond
	West Warwick**
1986	Barrington
	Hopkinton
1987	Cumberland
	Foster
	Johnston
	Warren
1988	Central Falls

*Pre-one program initiated
**Transitional-one program initiated

APPENDIX D

Primary Purpose of Transition Programs in RI Districts

Name of District	Primary Purpose		
	Academic	Social/Emotional	Both
Barrington			X
Bristol	X		
Burrillville		X	
Central Falls	X		
Charlestown			X
Cumberland	X		
East Greenwich	X		
Exeter-West Greenwich		X	
Foster		X	
Hopkinton			X
Johnston		X	
Middletown			X
Narragansett			X
Newport		X	
Pawtucket			X
Portsmouth		X	
Providence			X
Richmond	X		
South Kingston		X	
Warren			X
West Warwick	X*	X**	
Westerly			X
Woonsocket			X
	6	8	10

*primary purpose of transitional-one program

**primary purpose of pre-one program

APPENDIX E Class Size and Percent of Originating Class

Name of District	Level	Class Size	% Orig. Class
Barrington	pre-1	15	14
Bristol	pre-1	15-18	9
	pre-2	15-18	9
Burrillville	pre-k	20	18.9
	pre-1	20	28.2
Central Falls	pre-1	15	12
Charlestown	pre-1	14-18	15-18
Cumberland	pre-1	18	6
East Greenwich	pre-1	13	8
Exeter-West Greenwich	pre-1	21	23
Foster	pre-1	12	20
Hopkinton	pre-1	16	33
Johnston	pre-1	21	35
Middletown	pre-1	15	7.5
Narragansett	pre-1	20	25
Newport	pre-k	15	NR
	pre-1	15	16
Pawtucket	pre-1	12	15
Portsmouth	pre-1	15	24
Providence	pre-1	26	35
Richmond	pre-1	13-15	15
South Kingston	pre-1	20	13
Warren	pre-k	13-15	10
	pre-1	13-15	10
West Warwick	pre-1	18	13
	trans-1	18	13
Westerly	pre-1	15	5.7
Woonsocket	pre-k	25	15
	pre-1	25	11

APPENDIX F

Class Size In Rank Order*

Foster	12	
Pawtucket	12	
East Greenwich	13	
Barrington	15	
Central Falls	15	
Middletown	15	
Newport	15	
	15	MEDIAN CLASS SIZE BY NUMBER OF DISTRICTS= 16
Portsmouth	15	
Richmond	15	
Warren	15	
	15	AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY NUMBER OF DISTRICTS= 17
Westerly	15	
Hopkinton	16	
Bristol	18	
	18	MEDIAN CLASS SIZE BY NUMBER OF PROGRAMS= 18
Charlestown	18	
Cumberland	18	
West Warwick	18	
	18	AVERAGE CLASS SIZE BY NUMBER OF PROGRAMS= 18
Burrillville	20	
	20	
Narragansett	20	
South Kingston	20	
Exeter-W. Greenwich	21	
Johnston	21	
Woonsocket	25	
	25	
Providence	26	

*When district reported class size as a range, the higher number was used for computing order as that was assumed to be the maximum class size.

APPENDIX G

Percent of Originating Class in Rank Order

Westerly	5.7	
Cumberland	6	
Middletown	7.5	
East Greenwich	8	
Bristol	9	
	9	(T-2)
Warren	10	(Dev-K)
	10	
Woonsocket	11	
Central Falls	12	
South Kingston	13	
West Warwick	13	
	13	
Barrington	14	
Pawtucket	15	
Richmond	15	
Woonsocket	15	(Dev-K)
Newport	NR	(Pre-K)
	19	
Charlestown	18	
Burrillville	18.9	(Pre-K)
Foster	20	
Exeter-West Greenwich	23	
Portsmouth	24	
Narragansett	25	
Burrillville	28.2	
Hopkinton	33	
Johnston	35	
Providence	35	

MEDIAN PERCENT OF ORIGINATING CLASS BY NUMBER OF DISTRICTS* = 15

MEDIAN PERCENT OF ORIGINATING CLASS BY NUMBER OF PROGRAMS** = 14.5

*Calculation based on a total of 25 districts as Woonsocket and Burrillville were counted 2x.

**Calculation based on total of 28 programs as there was 1 non-response.

APPENDIX H

Relationship of Per Pupil Expenditure (PPE) and Percent of Originating Class and Primary Purpose of Transition Programs

DISTRICT	PPE	PERCENT OF ORIGINATING CLASS	PRIMARY PURPOSE		
			Academic	Soc/Emot	Both
Districts with above average PPE					
Barrington	4735	14			YES
East Greenwich	4748	8	YES		
Johnston	4362	35		YES	
Narragansett	4232	25			YES
Newport	5008	15		YES	
Pawtucket	4178	15			YES
Portsmouth	4336	24		YES	
Providence	4252	35			YES
South Kingston	4185	13		YES	
Warren	4359	10			YES
		19% average			
Districts with average PPE					
Bristol	4034	9	YES		
Charlestown	4058	18			YES
Cumberland	4050	6	YES		
Hopkinton	4031	33			YES
Middletown	4011	8			YES
West Warwick	4004	18		YES	
		18	YES		
		16% average			
Districts with below average PPE					
Burrillville	3585	19		YES	
		28			
Central Falls	3351	12	YES		
Exeter-W Greenwich	3468	23		YES	
Foster	3247	20		YES	
Richmond	3114	15	YES		
Woonsocket	3867	15			YES
		11			
Westerly	3413	8			YES
		17% average			

ABOVE AVERAGE PPE = >4127
AVERAGE PPE = 4027
BELOW AVERAGE PPE = <3927

APPENDIX I

Districts Without Transition Programs

Name of District	Consideration of Transition Program	
	YES	NO
Coventry	X	
Cranston		X
East Providence	X	
Glocester	X	
Jamestown	X	
Lincoln		X
Little Compton	X	
New Shoreham	X	
North Kingston	X	
North Providence		X
North Smithfield	X	
Scituate		X
Smithfield	X	
Tiverton	X	
Warwick	X	
TOTALS:	11	4